

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/719,141	NOVIS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew T Piziali	1775	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Andrew T Piziali.

(3) Jerold Schneider.

(2) Deborah Jones.

(4) GUY. FARMER

Date of Interview: 17 December 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant
2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: USPN 5,595,825 USPN 5,584,902 USPN 6,398,925.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant asserted that neither Arbab, Guiselin, nor the combination teaches the partial oxidation of all the NiCr layers. Applicant asserted that Hartig fails to teach the partial oxidation of the NiCr layers.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required